

The thursday report

Concordia University—Montreal, Quebec
SPECIAL EDITION

Volume 4, Number 28 — June 9, 1981

SPECIAL EDITION

\$3 million trimmed

Special budget committee releases report: Cuts to affect everyone

Nearly every aspect of university life will be affected should the cost-cutting recommendations of a special budget committee be accepted by Concordia's Board of Governors later this month. **The complete text of the report begins on page 2.)**

The six-member committee, appointed two months ago by Rector John O'Brien, was charged with finding ways to reduce the university's level of spending by \$3 million. This followed the announcement by the provincial government of funding increases of 6.5 per cent for 1981-82, close to five per cent below the current level of inflation.

The \$3 million cut still leaves the university with an accumulated deficit of \$5.6 million as of May 31, 1981. By September, Concordia must submit a plan to the Dept. of Education for the elimination of this deficit.

Next year's budget will also be affected by annual debt charge of approximately \$1 million on the \$5.6 million deficit.

Although the committee was asked to ensure that its actions harmed neither academic quality nor Concordia's ability to meet the needs of its students, certain recommendations will have a marked effect.

It is clear that new academic programs will no longer be introduced unless funding is forthcoming from the government, and university plans to introduce testing and tutoring in written expression will have to be dropped.

A five per cent drop in the course sections offered by the university will lead to larger classes in many areas, particularly in the Faculty of Arts and Science.

In the Faculty of Fine Arts, instructors will now be on hand for only four of the six hours of studio courses, and music students will see their private study fee rise from \$100 to \$250.

All engineering students will now have to take their second as well as their final years on the Sir George Williams campus as second-year offerings in the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science are phased out at Loyola (third year was phased out several years ago).

The Faculty of Commerce and Administration, although experiencing a relatively minor cut, will have to reduce enrolment in order to cope with the overcrowding that has plagued the business faculty for a number of years.

Library hours will be cut back an hour a day, and Concordia's four libraries will be forced to remain closed on statutory and university holidays. This is in addition to a cutback in part-time reference librarian support and other user aids.

Students will also notice a deterioration in registration-related services. Registrar's service areas will close 90 minutes earlier each day, and the university will introduce

or raise fees for such items as course changes, late registration, supplemental exams, academic re-evaluation, lost ID cards, copies of student records, graduation and locker rental. University calendars, until now free on demand, will be sold, except for the one free calendar that will be issued to each applicant. Fall convocation will also be abolished.

In addition to the inconveniences that will become apparent to all members of the university community—less frequent cleaning, maintenance and mail service, continued strict telephone policies and less heating and cooling—certain cuts will have a direct impact on Concordia employees.

Although the "Parizeau formula" (remuneration of public employees tied to the cost of living) calls for pay raises of 16.32 per cent (including benefits and based on the current inflation rate of 12 per cent), non-unionized staff received only a 6.7 per cent increase on June 1.

Adhering to the Parizeau formula, as many universities with a larger proportion of unionized employees already find themselves forced to do, would increase

Concordia's deficit by \$5 million.

Elsewhere in Quebec, the situation is also serious. McGill, for example, is predicting a 1981-82 deficit of \$2.6 million (\$15.5 million if the contingency of \$12.9 million to cover increases in non-union salaries beyond the 6.75 per cent June 1 interim increase is included).

At the Université de Sherbrooke, an \$8.7 million deficit is expected, despite the \$3.2 million that was trimmed from the current year's budget. The high deficit is partially accounted for by the university's collective agreements, which tie it to the Parizeau formula.

Laval is expecting its first-ever deficit next year, approximately \$6 million, and the Université du Québec à Montréal believes its current accumulated deficit of \$5.6 million will reach \$10 million by this time next year. UQAM plans to cut enrolment to 1980 levels to help ease its financial situation.

At first glance, all Quebec universities find themselves in a similar situation: serious cuts in funding coupled with significant increases in expenditures. And

although it is impossible to minimize the impact the government action will have on the entire university system (the government's own advisory body, the Conseil des universités, calls the reductions "brutal" and "unacceptable"), in many ways Concordia finds itself in an even more dangerous position.

Years of underfunding (Concordia's per-student grant is only two-thirds of the Quebec average) have left the university ill-equipped to deal with the cuts it now faces, and as the rector notes in a statement released today and reprinted below, "cutting our budget by at least \$3 million and holding salaries below the rise in the cost of living ... is at best a short-term solution."

The university, he insists, "will miss no opportunity" to impress on the government the need for increased funding.

The special budget committee report will be discussed by Senate's priorities and resource allocation committee (June 12) and by Senate itself (June 18, 2:30 p.m. AD-128) before the rector makes his final recommendations to the Board of Governors in late June.

A statement by the rector: "The university is being denied the ability to innovate and improve"

The Special Budget Committee was given the assignment of recommending ways to cut \$3 million from our operating budget—leading, that is, to a budget for 1981-82 less by \$3 million than in 1980-81 before any adjustment for salary increases. It has now issued a very thoughtful report, the result of extensive and probing study. During the coming two weeks it will be reviewed by the university community, and by the end of the month I propose to recommend to the Board of Governors the action that has to be taken.

Its mandate required the committee to protect academic quality and our ability to meet students' needs, but clearly some unwelcome action in this connection has become inevitable. The committee recommendations imply a reduction of about five per cent in the course sections we can offer and an increase in the number of students accepted into many classes. They reduce faculty availability to Fine Arts students in studio courses. They require a cut in the hours the library is kept open, and otherwise adversely affect library service. And we shall all notice the deterioration in cleaning and maintenance, already less than satisfactory, and in the

heating and cooling of our buildings.

Highly significant is what is not stated specifically. This university has worked hard to keep some flexibility in the development of new programs and new academic services. This has now disappeared. New programs will not be introduced unless they are funded directly by the government. Our plans to introduce a system that will ensure students' competence of written expression, generally agreed to be of major importance, cannot be implemented. The university is being denied the ability to improve and innovate.

You will likely have read or heard of similar protests by other Quebec universities. In one way we are all in the same boat. But in another way the situation of Concordia is more serious: we have ended 1980-81 with an accumulated deficit of \$5.6 million, the result of persistent underfunding and of the failure of government to follow through on its earlier moves to raise the level of our grants to something closer to that of the others. It is now only two-thirds of the Quebec average on a per-student basis.

The other universities are forecasting deficits because under their union contracts

they foresee having to pay salary increases in the order of 14 to 16 per cent—what is known as the Parizeau formula. We have announced an interim salary increase to non-unionized full-time personnel of 6.7 per cent across the board, the adjustment actually provided by government. Any further adjustment would mean an increase in the ongoing deficit unless there were a decided change in government policy.

We should not rest under any illusions. By cutting our budget by at least \$3 million and holding salary increases below the rise in the cost of living, this university may be able to maintain relative financial stability in the current year. But relatively only; inflation is today running at 12 per cent annually and this affects institutions as well as individuals. Clearly, this is at best a short-term solution. Demand for our services remains strong and demonstrates the importance of Concordia University to the community. Government has a responsibility to the community to maintain Concordia as a viable centre of higher education. We will certainly miss no opportunity to impress this message on government.

John W. O'Brien
Rector & Vice-Chancellor

Report of the Special Budget Committee

June 5, 1981

Background

A Special Budget Committee was struck by the Rector subsequent to the Board of Governors' resolution on April 9, 1981. The committee consisted of Vice-Rector G. Martin, Chairman, Dr. A. Antoniou, Dean M. Cohen, Dean A. Emery, Dr. S. McEvenue, Mr. F. Papineau and Mr. W. M. Reay.

The committee's mandate was to review budgets and expenditures of all academic and administrative departments in fiscal 1980-81. It was then to recommend ways by which the assigned budget of these departments could be reduced by a total amount of \$3 million. Such budgetary reductions were to be carefully controlled to minimize the effect upon the academic quality of the institution. The reductions were also to respect the university personnel policies and a specific decision which did not allow full-time staff reduction through lay-off but did allow staff reduction through attrition or transfer.

The committee met over twenty times in the six-week period, normally for half-day sessions; it held several full-day sessions. It met with all senior department heads, deans, vice-rectors and Rector. It also met with the Concordia University Non-Academic Staff Association and the Concordia University Students' Association. It extended an invitation as well to the Concordia University Faculty Association and to the Graduate Students' Association; however, neither group chose to appear before the committee.

In establishing the framework for presentations to be made to it, the committee used the set of guidelines attached. It requested department heads to provide details of reductions up to ten per cent of the department's current budget, with at least two lesser cuts proposed. In each case, the department head concerned was asked to explain to the committee the impact of the budget reductions proposed.

The committee also made a general request to members of the university community and those making presentations to it asking for suggestions of ways in which it could fulfill its mandate. The response was good and generated over 180 suggestions. Most have been investigated by the committee. In some cases, the committee felt the matter was outside its mandate; however, in others, the suggestions concerned have been incorporated

in the committee's recommendations.

The committee wishes to emphasize the very positive atmosphere that was presented by all appearing before it. All involved recognized the unpleasantness of the job that had to be done and approached the problem in as positive a vein as possible. The committee sincerely expresses its appreciation to those involved.

Results

The committee was given the mandate to recommend measures which would result in a reduction of \$3 million from the 1980-81 budget in order to achieve a balanced budget in 1981-82 leaving aside the question of salary increases.

In order to achieve its goal, the Special Budget Committee recommends that the cutback and increased revenue measures listed below be implemented. Each item in the list has an associated dollar amount. Due to the nature of some of the measures, the total amounts will not be realized in 1981-82. Reduction in ongoing commitments through attrition or transfer, for example, will certainly not save the amounts indicated in 1981-82. In the case of one-year savings, the vacant-positions money listed may be overestimates since we are not recommending a freeze on hiring. By the same token, increased revenues through penalty fees may be avoided and hence only generate a small percentage of the figures associated with them. The total of such paper amounts is \$3,531,300. These measures will result in a reduction in 1981-82 made up of ongoing commitments from the 1980-81 budget of \$2,727,000 and a one-year saving in 1981-82 of \$251,000.

For those who may think that our recommendations might lead to a surplus in 1982-83, or subsequent years, as the full impact of the reductions is realized, a word of caution. This budget exercise has been made on the whole as if inflation were not with us.

Escalating prices of supplies and materials, increased costs of fuel, telephone rate increases, not to mention salary raises and high interest rates, still make a large operating deficit a high probability unless corrective action is provided by the Quebec government in the funding of the university.

List of Budget Recommendations

In preparing the list, the committee has provided a very brief explanation of the items concerned and certain key notes are appended to the end to explain some of the terms used. Where appropriate, the list indicates savings in 1981-82 only, due to the transient nature of such savings.

Alternative possibilities the committee has not considered appropriate are not listed.

A. Proposed reduction in departmental expenditures

1. Faculty of Arts and Science—Division I

1.1	Net reduction of full-time salary budget (Faculty 16,100; non-faculty 18,200)	\$ 34,300
1.2	Reduction in part-time teaching masse salariale by 15 per cent	228,000
1.3	Reduction in discretionary stipends	2,600
1.4	Other reductions: non-salary and part-time secretarial	8,400
1.5	Temporary vacancy secretarial (1981/82)	2,500
		<u>\$275,800</u>

2. Faculty of Arts and Science—Division II

2.1	Net reduction in full-time salary budget	\$ 21,200
2.2	Reduction in part-time teaching masse salariale by 11.8 per cent	89,000
2.3	Reduction in discretionary stipends	5,000
2.4	Other reductions: non-salary, etc.	1,700
2.5	Temporary vacancy secretarial (1981/82)	2,500
		<u>\$119,400</u>

3. Faculty of Arts and Science—Division III

3.1	Net reduction in full-time salary budget	\$232,000
3.2	Special reduction in full-time salary for 1981/82 only	94,400
3.3	Reduction in part-time teaching masse salariale of 8.6 per cent	58,000
3.4	Reduction in part-time support staff	33,700
3.5	Reduction in non-salary	6,000
		<u>\$424,100</u>

4. Faculty of Arts and Science—Division IV

4.1	Miscellaneous salaries (net)	\$ 11,000
-----	------------------------------	-----------

5. Faculty of Arts and Science—General

(Overall Base Budget \$27.2M)		
5.1	Reduction of part-time faculty reserve	\$ 90,500
5.2	The faculty is prepared to reduce support staff through attrition or transfer of four positions. Because of the time involved, this is estimated only as a saving of \$35,000 in 1981/82	35,000
		<u>\$125,500</u>

6. Faculty of Engineering

(Base Budget \$6.7M)		
6.1	Move of second-year Engineering at Loyola to SGW	\$ 60,000

6.2	Vacancies, based on 1980/81	100,000
6.3	Part-time budget not used in 1980/81	43,000
6.4	Other items	15,000
		<u>\$218,000</u>

7. Faculty of Commerce and Administration

(Base Budget \$5.96M)		
7.1	In view of the size and pressures on this faculty, no major cuts are recommended at this time; however, some part-time faculty money was not spent in 1980/81 due to non-availability of qualified faculty	\$54,600

8. Faculty of Fine Arts

(Base Budget \$4.5M)		
8.1	Reduce teaching hours in some Fine Arts studio courses from 6 to 4. Students continue to have 6 hours, but teacher is not present for initial set-up hour, nor final clean-up hour	\$ 80,000
8.2	Raise fee for private music study by \$100 per student to \$250 per student. This would be in line with that charged at other universities.	37,000
8.3	Cancel one fractional appointment and treat the arts supply store as an ancillary enterprise, moving salary of store manager from the admissible budget	32,500
8.4	Other items	10,000
		<u>\$159,500</u>

9. Graduate Studies

(Base Budget \$222,000)		
9.1	The committee recommends strict adherence to approved budget. This will require discontinuance of the promotional booklet, cutback in printing, and several other reductions.	

10. Academic General

(Base Budget \$1.523M)		
10.1	Reduction in funding of grants to:	
	• Conferences by \$12,000	
	• New program appraisals by \$10,000	
	• Institute of Comparative Physical Education by \$2,300	
	• Conservatory of Cinematographic Art by \$15,000	
		<u>\$39,300</u>

11. Library

(Base Budget \$5.6M)		
11.1	Reduction in full-time salary budget through use of under expenditure in 1980/81 and the selective deferring of appointments to fill vacancies	\$155,000
11.2	Reduction in part-time reference librarian support	17,200
11.3	Reduced opening hours from midnight	

	to 11:00 p.m. Library closed on statutory and university holidays	38,800
11.4	Reduced user aids including the <i>Owner's Manual</i> and the mailing of acquisition list to faculty	10,400
11.5	Reduction in general part-time staff	12,100
11.6	Reduction in supplies, Xerox and printing, minor equipment	10,700
11.7	Benefits (net) reduction	14,000
11.8	Travel and development reduction	5,500
11.9	Increased revenue (already earned but not budgeted in 1980/81)	23,500
		<u>\$287,200</u>

12. Computer Centre

(Base Budget \$1.7M)		
12.1	Reduction of number of positions in data input area in view of new on-line data input techniques. The department will use attrition and/or transfer covered in meantime by vacancy money	\$ 85,000
12.2	Increase in net revenue from outside sources	44,000
12.3	Cancel paid part-time programmer-on-duty on Loyola campus (no such service provided on SGW campus now)	1,600
12.4	Increase charges to research users through stiffer enforcement of policy	3,000
12.5	Charge for dial access usage during prime time from 9 to 5	3,000
12.6	Mount stringent campaign to avoid wastage of paper and cards	4,000
		<u>\$140,600</u>

13. Audio-visual

(Base Budget \$1.1M)		
13.1	Elimination of TV land line to Norris and dial-in language lab facilities and service contract	\$ 6,000
13.2	Reduction of hours of opening of depots; language lab part-time staff; part-time staff in Studio D	17,700
13.3	It is felt that a reduction in various items can be achieved through allocation of certain budgets to be administered directly by departments rather than AVD. It is felt such reallocation would increase efficiency and lessen wastage. Detailed analysis would indicate savings of	\$22,500
13.4	Elimination of service for observation classrooms	5,000
13.5	Increase non-academic rates ten per cent	4,500
		<u>\$55,700</u>

14. Registrar

(Base Budget \$1.74M)		
14.1	Reduction in Registrar's Services Department	

hours of operation to 9:00 a.m.-7:00 p.m.

		\$ 3,400
14.2	Reduction in printing costs by cheaper paper (schedules)	4,000
14.3	Eliminate part-time receptionist in Exams Office	2,000
14.4	Centralize registration at Loyola	33,600
14.5	Eliminate payment for faculty advisors at registration	18,000
14.6	Eliminate fall convocation	10,000
14.7	Future savings—position eliminated by use of word processor will save \$18,000 in future years but no current saving unless word processor paid from capital	
14.8	The committee has considered the question of paid invigilation. It is apparent that there is a split opinion on this matter due chiefly to the requirements of the current cheating regulations. While the committee does not feel it can cancel paid invigilators entirely, it feels strongly that full-time faculty can and should invigilate their own exams.	20,000
		<u>\$91,000</u>

15. Admission, liaisons and advertising

(Base Budget \$1.6M)

15.1	Reorganize and merge two admissions offices to achieve a reduction across both of two positions through attrition and reduction in part-time	\$ 38,000
15.2	Reduce non-salary budget of Assistant Vice-Rector's office	5,700
15.3	Not publish summer calendar but replace with summer timetable	15,000
15.4	Cancel one liaison officer position (currently vacant) and non-salary reduction	26,000
15.5	Review of STUDAS operation a) with a view to integration with another operation b) reduction of full-time salary budget c) reduction of part-time salary budget d) reduction in books and subscriptions; travel e) reduction in number of reports produced	6,000
15.6	Calendar	
15.6.1	Possible publication of calendar every two years. This should result in a saving of \$50,000 per year, but such conflicting reports on the impact and, indeed, whether or not savings would result, left the committee with no choice but to recommend further study and not assume the savings	
15.6.2	One provided free to every applicant—other copies available at \$2 through bookstore	15,000
15.6.3	Use less expensive paper	3,000
15.6.4	Cancel mailing of calendars—use of pickup cards where appropriate	2,000
		<u>\$91,000</u>

16. Treasurer's office

(Base Budget \$2.4M)

16.1	Change of method of interest collection on outstanding accounts (from flat fee to one per cent per month, already implemented by Board of Governors)	\$ 75,000
16.2	Increase interest on outstanding accounts ¼% per month	45,000
16.3	Reorganization of functions of the Student Accounts offices to eliminate a part-time clerical position and achieve efficiencies between two student accounts offices of two full-time positions—reduction to be achieved by attrition or transfer	30,000
16.4	Other cost reductions (insurance, audit, travel, bank charges, etc.).	15,000
		<u>\$165,000</u>

17. Human resources and safety office

(Base Budget \$648,000)

17.1	Reduction of part-time staff	\$ 7,000
17.2	Cut out subsidy to staff hockey league for ice time (the committee feels the league should continue, but athletics not charge for ice time)	1,000
17.3	Cutback in contracted services (recruiting, advertising, consulting, etc.)	6,000
17.4	Miscellaneous items—non-salary (courses, memberships, reference material, etc.).	3,800
		<u>\$ 17,800</u>

18. Physical resources

(Base Budget \$7.6M)

18.1	Reduction of work force through attrition by eight per cent of number of positions	\$278,000
18.2	Increased energy conservation through establishment of 68° to 78° temperature range. To be implemented with due consideration of research facilities	103,000
18.3	Reduction in cleaning of non-public areas from daily to once or twice a week	50,000
18.4	Reduction in window cleaning at Loyola from four times per year to once a year (as at SGW currently)	14,000
18.5	Reduction in maintenance on equipment, supplies and materials, landscaping, and similar	75,000
		<u>\$520,000</u>

19. Security

(Base Budget \$736,000)

19.1	The committee does not recommend any reduction in this budget but does suggest postponing as long as feasible the filling of a safety vacancy on the Loyola campus, with service being provided from the SGW campus	\$ 15,000
------	---	-----------

20. Telephones

(Base Budget Net Long Distance \$769,000)

20.1	Continued implementation of Policy TS-1	\$ 20,000
20.2	Curtailment of evening switchboard service at Loyola to close at 8 p.m. instead of 9 p.m.	3,500
20.3	Share telephones between faculty members—while the committee does not make this recommendation at this time, it wants to alert the community that such a step will probably become inevitable in the near future if telephone rates continue to increase	\$ 23,500

21. Distribution services

(Base Budget \$486,000)

21.1	Postpone filling of available vacancy and/or reduction in part-time budget	\$ 15,000
21.2	Reorganization of total inventory system to be replaced with audit system	20,500
21.3	Reduction in non-salary expenditures	3,700
21.4	Revision of locker rental rates (rental increase \$5 to \$10; refund increase \$3 to \$5)	10,000
		<u>\$ 49,200</u>

22. Mail services

(Base Budget \$273,000)

22.1	Cut one mail run per day (by attrition or transfer)	\$22,000
------	---	----------

23. Purchasing

(Base Budget \$328,000)

23.1	Full-time salary reduction of one position (currently vacant) and net replacements	\$ 27,400
23.2	Reduction in part-time budget	3,500
		<u>\$ 30,900</u>

24. Public relations

(Base Budget \$265,000)

24.1	Curtailment of <i>Concordia Magazine</i> to three issues of circulation of 20,000 each for at least one year until lists are updated and accurate	\$ 30,000
24.2	Provision for external advertising in <i>Thursday Report</i>	8,000
24.3	Tighten control on circulation lists to prevent wastage	\$ 38,000

25. Development and alumni

(Base Budget \$363,000)

25.1	Because of the imminent major public campaign, the committee could not realistically assess cuts to this group. It feels strongly, however, that the budget for this area should be reduced or greater revenue achieved by the units concerned	
25.2	It recommends that the university review its budgeting to see what expenses should be charged against the capital campaign rather than the regular operating budget	
25.3	It is apparent that the alumni mailing lists are inaccurate. A serious effort should be made to correct these lists.	

26. Archives

(Base Budget \$128,000)

26.1	As a result of reorganization, a total reduction of budget and reorientation of the function is planned	\$ 53,000
26.2	Postponement of the hiring of a new director for service for six months (temporary saving only)	15,000
		<u>\$ 68,000</u>

27. Rector's office

(including Ombudsman, Translation, Conference and Information Centre: Base Budget \$1.19M)

27.1	Reduction in full-time salary budget	\$ 75,000
27.2	Reduction in general administration expenses, including receptions, etc.	10,000
27.3	Reduction in special projects, including cutback in faculty/staff French courses	33,000
		<u>\$118,000</u>

28. Vice-Rector, Administration and Finance

(including Legal Services, Internal Audit, Staff Health Services, Garnet Key: Base Budget \$627,000)

28.1	Reduction in full-time salary budget	\$ 45,000
28.2	Miscellaneous other reductions (non-salary)	15,000
		<u>\$ 60,000</u>

29. Vice-Rectors Academic

(including Faculty Personnel, Research Office, CCSL, Deans of Students, etc.: Base Budget \$778,000)

29.1	Reduction in full-time salary budget by one position (currently vacant) and reallocation of other salary costs	\$ 22,500
------	--	-----------

29.2	Reduction, non-salary items (travel, supplies, etc.)	11,100
29.3	Special 1981/82 vacancy saving	10,000
		<u>\$ 43,600</u>

29. Miscellaneous small departments

(Institutional Research; Ancillary Enterprises; Food Services; and similar: Base Budget \$231,000)

30.1	By their size, these departments cannot effect meaningful non-salary reductions. It is hoped, however, that studies integrating STUDAS and OIR will result in more effective operations and eventual savings.	
------	---	--

B. General reductions

1. Long distance phone calls: The committee recommends that ten per cent of the long distance budget of all departments be cut and ways devised to maintain efficiency by a more resourceful use of direct dialling, by more efficient use of time on the phone, by a suitable control system to recover personal or otherwise funded calls, and by use of the mails. A system of tight controls has been shown to reduce long distance charges significantly.

Estimated savings: \$16,500

2. Control on paper proliferation: Many representations to the committee noted the quantity and expense of paper which circulates in the university. The quantity results in part from the collegial and democratic nature of decision-making at Concordia, but there appears to be an excess; for example, "notices" are received from printing and circulated by the mailing department. They range from one page to 40 in length, and they are distributed from 100 to 1,800 recipients. Last year there were over 100,000 such notices. This represents an astronomical number of pages and of deliveries. We can only guess at the exact numbers.

In discussing this problem in light of a report presented to it by Printing Services and in view of the diversity of the university, the committee could not present a simplistic mechanism to control this problem. Instead, it recommends that an individual be appointed the "Czar of Paper" with a mandate to review the printing done by departments and material circulating in the university and order curtailment of wasteful operations. While the committee feels a ten percent reduction in printing costs would be desirable (savings: \$100,000) it feels that only \$50,000 would be practical in 1981/82. The committee would nominate Professor H. McQueen as the Czar.

Estimated savings: \$50,000

C. Fee increases

1. Application fee: It was recommended to the committee that a \$15 admission fee be established which would make Concordia consistent with other universities in the province. It would appear that such a fee might not be beneficial to the university depending on government treatment. The committee recommends that the matter be given further study. Potential revenue: \$190,000.

2. Course change fee: The committee recommends the reinstatement of a course change fee at \$5 per form. The savings from this fee will either be achieved through the fee itself or, if the number of changes drops, the load caused by processing such changes. In the event that the change is required by the university, the charge would be waived.

\$70,000

3. Miscellaneous processing charges: The committee recommends the following charges. In each case the charges are for things which the student could avoid by proper care.

3.1	\$5 for replacement of lost I.D. card	\$ 6,750
3.2	Raise late registration fee from \$10 to \$25	26,550
3.3	\$2 charge for extra T2202 forms (first set provided free)	4,000
3.4	\$1 charge for extra copies of student records (first one provided free)	10,000
3.5	\$5 for extra letters of attestation (first one provided free)	22,500
3.6	Increase fee for mailing degrees from \$2 to \$5 (free if picked up)	2,000

4. Revision of other fees: The committee recommends the following charges. In each case the student could avoid the charged by satisfactory performance. It should be noted that each charge is less than the expense incurred to process the item in question.

4.1	Increase supplemental fee from \$10 to \$15	\$ 3,000
4.2	Increase late completion fee from \$10 to \$15	1,500
4.3	Establish a re-evaluation fee at \$15, which will be refunded if re-evaluation is in the student's favour	4,500

Increase in graduation fee: In view of the increased costs associated with the printing of degrees, convocations and related matters, the committee recommends an increase in the graduation fee from \$20 to \$30. The new fee will still be less than the cost of graduation.

\$30,000

NOTES FOR THE LIST

1. In the list, the term "net reduction in full-time salary budget" implies that a saving in the component of budget set aside for full-time staff will be achieved from operations such as: the replacement of one individual by another at a lower salary; the fact that a given position is vacant and will subsequently be closed and not filled; or, out of a number of positions, turnover is such that there will normally be one or more positions vacant.
2. In projecting revenues from fee changes, an estimate was made of the length of lead time required before the fee change will actually go into effect. For example, the alteration in deferred payment fee into a per-month service charge will only come into effect in September. The amount of the application fee is not included in the totals until its status can be determined.
3. Certain changes indicated above are for 1981/82 only. In such a case, the savings may come about from a vacancy which will be kept empty for part or all of the year or indeed a situation where certain supplies and materials might not be bought in the next year, or some publication will not be published for the next year but will be reinstated in future years.

Summary totals

A. Expense reductions

Unit	Approx. budget (000)	Savings (000)	%
1. Arts & Science, Div. I	275.8		
2. Arts & Science, Div. II	119.4		
3. Arts & Science, Div. III	424.1		
4. Arts & Science, Div. IV	11.0		
5. Arts & Science General	125.5		
Total Arts & Science	(27,242)	955.8	3.52
6. Engineering	(6,700)	218.0	3.25
7. Commerce	(5,960)	54.6	0.92
8. Fine Arts	(4,500)	159.5	3.55
9. Graduate Studies	(222)	0	
10. Academic General	(1,523)	39.3	2.58
11. Library	(5,600)	287.2	5.12
12. Computer Centre	(1,700)	140.6	8.23
13. Audio-Visual	(1,100)	55.7	5.06
14. Registrar	(1,740)	91.0	5.23
15. Admissions, Liaison, etc.	(1,600)	110.7	6.91
16. Treasurer	(2,400)	165.0	6.87
17. Human Resources & Safety	(648)	17.8	2.75
18. Physical Resources	(7,600)	520.0	6.84
19. Security	(736)	15.0	2.04
20. Telephones	(769)	23.5	3.06
21. Distribution	(486)	49.2	10.12
22. Mail	(273)	22.0	8.06
23. Purchasing	(328)	30.9	9.42
24. Public Relations	(265)	38.0	14.33
25. Development and Alumni	(363)	0	
26. Archives	(128)	68.0	53.10
27. Rector's Office	(1,190)	118.0	9.91
28. V.R., Admin. & Finance Office	(627)	60.0	9.57
29. Vice-Rectors, Academic Office	(778)	43.6	5.60
30. Miscellaneous small depts.	(231)	0	
	(74,610)	3,284.0	4.40

B. Across-the-board recommendations

1. Long distance telephones \$ 16,500
2. Paper proliferation (1981/82) 50,000

\$ 66,500

C. Fee changes

1. Institute application fee (may not be applicable—\$190,000)
2. Course change fee \$ 70,000
3. Miscellaneous processing charges 71,800
4. Graduation fee 30,000
5. Other fees 9,000

\$180,800

TOTAL SAVINGS

A. Departmental Expenditure Reductions	\$3,284,000
B. Across-the-Board	66,500
C. Fee Changes	180,800
	\$3,531,300

Other items

The committee received numerous suggestions for which direct savings could not be identified; however, indirect and diffuse savings should result. These are listed below:

1. Confidential envelopes: The committee received numerous suggestions about abandoning the use of confidential envelopes. While it is recognized that in some areas such as salary information, confidential envelopes are needed, it was felt that the current yellow ones should be discontinued and a different system using possibly a conventional envelope sealed inside a regular internal university envelope would suffice.

2. Recycled paper: Suggestions for recycling paper, whether through the use of old used documents as scratch pads; smaller sized memo pads; use of recycled paper; depositing of used paper for recycling in various spots in the university; etc., were recommended. In the list of recommendations, the committee suggests a "Czar of Paper". It would also recommend that he look into these areas and that indeed the whole community become sensitive to the savings that can be made through the proper use of paper.

3. Typewriters: The point was made that there are various departments with idle typewriters. The suggestion has been made, with which the committee concurs, that these typewriters be returned to a central pool where they can be used by others.

4. Advanced purchasing: The committee was made aware of a problem where individuals were ordering and paying for items in advance. Ostensibly this resulted in a price reduction for prepayment; however, in terms of the university's total financing, it meant higher borrowing costs and the university actually lost on the deal. A small prepayment discount was offset by a higher university loan. The committee recommends that this practice be discontinued unless clear advantages can be shown.

5. Number of copies of computer and other reports produced: It is apparent that a large number of unnecessary reports are produced by both computer and manual systems across the university. It is recommended that a systematic program be undertaken to review the production of such reports and to cancel unnecessary ones.

6. Copiers: An extensive amount of photocopying is done in the university. While some of this comes under the recommendation related to the "Czar of Paper", the committee also recommends that the number of photocopiers be reviewed and, where possible, cut down and shared; also that cheaper copiers be investigated (Printing Services have indicated that they are already studying this matter) and that two-sided copying or Ditto be used whenever feasible.

7. Handwritten memos: It was the opinion of various individuals, as presented to the committee, that far too many memos are typed when handwritten notes on speedi-memo forms, or equivalent, could do. The committee therefore suggests that attempts be made to cut down the typing of brief notes, replacing them with handwritten ones. It was felt that this would make a significant difference in secretarial workload.

8. Conference and related travel: The committee felt that the amount of conference and travel could be reduced, particularly in some administrative areas. While it is recognized that some travel is essential, it felt that much better coordination could be accomplished.

9. Suggestion box system: It was suggested that a system be established to encourage individuals to make suggestions to save money for the university. Such individuals would then be rewarded either through fixed monetary awards or some percentage of saving. The committee strongly endorses this recommendation and refers it to the administration for further action.

10. Institutes etc.: The committee feels strongly that the university should review the "raison d'être" and costs of certain peripheral institutes such as the Conservatory of Cinematographic Art, the Lacolle Centre, the Concordia Centre for Management Studies, the Sir George Williams Schools and similar. While the committee recognized the value of these units, it felt that in this time of budgetary compression the university should review them to ensure that the financial support by the university does not detract from the regular academic programs.

11. Internal charges: The committee received various representations about internal charges, chiefly focussing on Audio-Visual and Physical Plant charges. In investigating this matter, the committee recognized the mixture of advantages and disadvantages attendant upon an internal charging system. It feels that the chief problem lies in the lack of understanding in the university community of the internal charge-back system. It recommends, therefore, that those departments concerned and their users inform themselves more effectively of the system.

Implementation

While the committee is not directly involved with the implementation of its recommendations, it nevertheless felt it

should make some comments on it.

Firstly, while the vast majority of those responsible for budgets are very prudent and careful administrators, one or two of those involved demonstrated a cavalier attitude concerning budgets and budget control. The committee feels some stringent steps must be taken to bring such situations under control and to ensure that the managers respect their budgets.

Secondly, it was apparent from the presentations made to us that some of the cuts will represent the removal of a certain amount of freedom and "marge de manoeuvre" to the departments concerned. Department heads should be aware of this action and adjust their style of operation accordingly. Departments should also be aware that services previously available from other departments will be curtailed.

Thirdly, the committee recognizes that some of the proposals made may have to be modified in the light of reality later in the fiscal year. At such time, obviously, managerial discretion will have to be exercised; however, the committee must emphasize that this must be done within the budget framework in order to avoid increasing the deficit.

Finally, the university must realize that regardless of how hard or soft these cuts appear, they will be felt.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the Special Budget Committee feels it has accomplished the task assigned to it. It feels that the cuts listed above will generate a \$3 million saving in 1981-82 and not much more. It feels strongly that all recommendations should be implemented if that target is to be reached.

The committee would like to express its appreciation to all of those who worked with it and again emphasizes the excellent spirit of cooperation that was shown by all involved. It also cautions the university that while this type of emergency exercise can be done once, alternative methods of financial control must be developed for the future.

The committee holds itself available to meet with the Rector and others, if necessary, to discuss its recommendations.

A. Antoniou
M. Cohen
A. Emery
G. Martin (chairman)
S. McEvenue
F. Papineau
W. M. Reay

GUIDELINES FOR PRESENTATION

1. Background and overview of unit

Assume the committee is not aware of the functioning of the unit and provide a very brief (one page plus data) description of it—its purposes, services, budget, size, student impact, etc.

2. Budgetary compression

Assume the unit budget is to be compressed by at least ten per cent from June 1 on

- (i) What would be curtailed and cut out?
- (ii) What changes would result in services offered?
- (iii) What would be the impact on other departments and students/staff?
- (iv) Is there a short-term/long-term perspective (i.e., would you do something initially and then change the cuts later as staff, etc., permit?)
- (v) Is timing important?

Be prepared to discuss any alternatives you may have considered and rejected.

When presenting the proposal for cuts, subdivide the ten percent figure into at least three smaller components (more if desired) showing the priority and percentages for each.

3. Other general suggestions

- (i) Are there any university-wide services or practices that should be altered? Why?
- (ii) Are there current budget practices which are constraining or wasteful (e.g. capital versus operating, etc.)?
- (iii) Anything else.

The committee assumes the presentation will be in two parts—a written submission and an interview session. While it is possible that a second session may be required, this should not be assumed.

The written submission should be sent to the committee prior to the interview.

The oral presentation will be made by one spokesman supported by one or two resource people, as required. If a larger format is desired (e.g. with department chairmen attending) please indicate so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

The onus is on the presenter to provide all pertinent data to support the presentation.

Contact person for the presentation is the chairman, G. Martin, BC-C103, L.2817.